



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/764,321	01/16/2001	Mandayam Andampillai Sridhar	AMPSP004	7501	
32986	7590	11/19/2004	EXAMINER		
IPSG, P.C. P.O. BOX 700640 SAN JOSE, CA 95170-0640		FILIPCZYK, MARCIN R			
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER	
		2161			

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/764,321	SRIDHAR, MANDAYAM ANDAMPILLAI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marc R Filipczyk	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to Applicant's response filed on May 26, 2004.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/26/04 has been entered.

Claims 1-7 are amended and new claims 8-15 are submitted.

Drawings

Drawings submitted on January 16, 2001 are in compliance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "said hyperlink" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, as such, the claim is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weissman (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,524) in view of Luers, Atwood and Gennick (hereafter “Luers”) (Teach yourself PL/SQL in 21 days).

Regarding claims 1 and 15, Weissman discloses a computer-implemented method for automatically presenting relationship information between a first table and a second table of a database, comprising: (col. 3, lines 1 and 2, Weissman)

ascertaining an existence of a first foreign key relationship between first table and second table; (col. 3, lines 1-6 and col. 11, lines 26-46, Weissman)

if first foreign key relationship between first table and second table exists, automatically generating at run time first executable codes to create and populate data; (col. 3, lines 19-23 and col. 11, lines 26-46, Weissman) and,

(Note: Populating tables using code with foreign key)

when first given record is displayed in a view, also displaying first number of records in second table that references first given record (fig. 2; (figure 2 is not labeled, it falls in between fig. 1 and 3A), blocks 280 and 290, Weissman).

(Note: by generating a query, the system provides an answer set containing the desired records from both tables)

Art Unit: 2161

But, Weissman does not expressly teach obtaining the number of records in second table that reference the first given table. However, Luers teaches a count function among many other functions in Structured Queried language (SQL) where the count function can be implemented to return a total number of rows in a query (page 154, Luers). Since Weissman system keeps track of all the foreign keys (figures 3A-5D and related text), it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the count function taught by Luers in Weissman system to count the number of records in second table that reference the first given table. One would have been motivated to use a count function in Weissman because both Luers and Weissman use SQL language (col. 10, lines 43-46, Weissman).

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Weissman/Luers disclose records are hyperlinks (figures 3A and 6D, blocks 605 and 610, Weissman).

(Note: attribute key in box 605 is a foreign key (fk), further attribute in box 610 is a hyperlink)

Regarding claims 3-7 and 13, Weissman/Luers disclose numerous tables linked by foreign keys (figures 3A and 6D, blocks 605 and 610) which can be displayed according to user preferences (figures 7-29, Weissman).

(Note: Figures 7-29 describe a user interface that can be used for display, define a schema, build a datamart (table), and query the table)

Regarding claim 8, Weissman/Luers teach hyperlink is generated using HTML (col. 32, lines 55 and 56, Weissman).

Regarding claims 9 and 14, Weissman/Luers teach SQL code to determine foreign key relationship (col. 16, lines 20-56, Weissman).

Regarding claims 10 and 15, Weissman/Luers teach first executable codes are Java (col. 10, lines 1-13, Weissman).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on May 26, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments and responses are listed below.

Applicant argues on page 6 of the 5/26/04 response that the drawings of record are compliant.

In response, Examiner agrees. The objection to the drawings submitted January 16, 2001 is withdrawn.

Applicant argues on page 7 of the 5/26/04 response the importance of build time and run time amended in the independent claims.

In response, Examiner disagrees. After carefully re-examining the specification the Examiner did not find any support in the specification underlying special attention as to the time

Art Unit: 2161

of "build time" and/or "run time" but Examiner appreciates the definitions and references provided in the 5/26/04 response. Further it is noted that before "any" application can be executed it must first be loaded, as is now claimed.

Applicant argues on page 7 of the 5/26/04 response that Applicant maintains that populating tables using code with foreign key is different from obtaining the number of records in the second table that references the first given record.

In response, Examiner agrees. Even though the Examiner still believes that Weissman discloses all the subject matter claimed, after careful reconsideration of the Weissman system, the feature of obtaining a number of records based on references is not explicitly clear from the specification thus the rejection is withdrawn. However, Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

To expedite the process of examination Examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. amendments, 35 U.S.C. 112, objections and the like) set forth by the Examiner that Applicants provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where the best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc R Filipczyk whose telephone number is (571) 272-4019. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5pm.

Art Unit: 2161

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MF
November 10, 2004



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100